## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| •   |                       |                              |
|---|-----------------------|------------------------------|
|   | No. 19-6117           |                              |
| MICHAEL EUGENE HUNT,  |                       |                              |
| Plaintiff - App   | pellant,              |                              |
| v.  |                       |                              |
| JENNIFER J. KNOX, Wake Coun   | ty Trial Court Admii  | nistrator,                   |
| Defendant - A   | appellee.             |                              |
|   |                       |                              |
| Appeal from the United States Dis<br>Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, Dis |                       |                              |
| Submitted: May 23, 2019   |                       | Decided: May 29, 2019        |
| Before KING and RICHARDSON  | , Circuit Judges, and | SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge. |
| Affirmed by unpublished per curia                                     | m opinion.            |                              |
| Michael Eugene Hunt, Appellant P                                      | Pro Se.               |                              |
| Unpublished opinions are not bind                                     | ing precedent in this | circuit.                     |

## PER CURIAM:

Michael Eugene Hunt appeals the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (2012). On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because the informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, Hunt has forfeited appellate review of the dismissal of his complaint.\* *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

**AFFIRMED** 

<sup>\*</sup>We discern no abuse of discretion in the district court's denial of Hunt's motion for appointment of counsel. *See Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1277 n.5 (4th Cir. 1985) (providing standard).